	Case 2:13-cv-00281-JCM-CWH Document 14 Filed 04/25/14 Page 1 of 2		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8	JOLANTA SOYSAL, 2:	13-CV-281 JCM (CWH)	
9	Plaintiff(s),		
10			
11	V.		
12	GEICO GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY,		
13			
14	Defendant(s).		
15	ORDER		
16	Presently before the court are Magistrate Judge Hoffman's report and recommendation that		
17	the defendant's motion to enforce the settlement agreement be granted and that the case be dismissed		
18	with prejudice. (Doc. # 13). Plaintiff has not objected to the magistrate judge's report and the		
19	deadline to do so has expired.		
20	This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or		
21	recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects		
22	to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a de novo		
23	determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made."		
24	28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).		
25	Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all		
26	of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." <i>Thomas v. Arn</i> , 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).		
27	Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate		
28			
James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge			

## Case 2:13-cv-00281-JCM-CWH Document 14 Filed 04/25/14 Page 2 of 2

1	judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States v.
2	Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the
3	district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); see
4	also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's
5	decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review "any
6	issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's
7	recommendation, then this court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g.,
8	Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation
9	to which no objection was filed).
10	Nevertheless, this court finds it appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine
11	whether to adopt the recommendation of the magistrate judge. Upon reviewing the recommendation
12	and underlying briefs, this court finds good cause appears to ADOPT the magistrate's findings in
13	full.
14	Accordingly,
15	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that the magistrate judge's report
16	and recommendation (doc. # 13) be, and the same hereby are, ADOPTED in their entirety.
17	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant's motion to enforce the settlement agreement
18	(doc. # 11) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.
19	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the case is DISMISSED with prejudice. The clerk shall
20	enter judgment and close the case.
21	DATED April 25, 2014.
22	
23	Xellus C. Mahan
24	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25	
26	

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge

27

28